## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE:

FOSAMAX PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION :

\_\_\_\_\_X

This document relates to: :

Sozan Abdelghani v. Merck & Co., Inc., :

No. 08 Civ. 3203 (JFK) :

Rosemond Carol Altamirano
v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 08 Civ. 3199 (JFK)

Renate Attard v. Merck & Co., Inc., No. 06 Civ. 13440 (JFK)

Jeanne Blackwood v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 08 Civ. 10479 (JFK)

Charlette Burns v. Merck & Co., Inc., No. 08 Civ. 1803 (JFK)

Florence Caliguire
v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 11 Civ. 1731 (JFK)

Sylvia Cohn v. Merck & Co., Inc., No. 06 Civ. 11454 (JFK)

Cathey Hunter v. Merck & Co., Inc., No. 07 Civ. 9710 (JFK)

Debra Kirtman v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 07 Civ. 9710 (JFK)

Delcie Thomas v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 07 Civ. 9710 (JFK)

Alfida Donastorg v. Merck & Co., Inc., : No. 08 Civ. 4108 (JFK) :

Jose Escobar v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 08 Civ. 4104 (JFK)

Master File No. 06 MD 1789 (JFK)

ORDER

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 5-/0-/3

```
Madeline P. Galluzzo
v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 10 Civ. 4930 (JFK)
Claire Gilbert v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 08 Civ. 10480 (JFK)
Geraldine Gilliam v. Merck & Co., Inc.,:
No. 08 Civ. 3205 (JFK)
Harriett P. Groner
v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 06 Civ. 11455 (JFK)
Stacy Grossman and Donald Grossman
v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 10 Civ. 8674 (JFK)
Mary Guyant v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 07 Civ. 10471 (JFK)
Regina Horn v. Merck & Co., Inc.,
No. 08 Civ. 8073 (JFK)
```

## JOHN F. KEENAN, United States District Judge:

Defendant Merck has moved for dismissal of the above-captioned cases under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(f), 37(b)(2), and 41(b) because these plaintiffs have failed to comply with the Court's <u>Lone Pine</u> Order. As explained below, the motion is granted.

In an Opinion and Order dated November 20, 2012, the Court entered a Lone Pine order as to plaintiffs who did not allege osteonecrosis of the jaw or osteomyelitis. The Court stated that "the failure to comply with the terms of this Order within the time periods prescribed by this Order may result in the

dismissal of the delinquent plaintiffs' actions with prejudice."

(Opinion and Order of Nov. 20, 2013 at 12.) For the abovecaptioned plaintiffs, the Court required compliance by February
20, 2013. On March 13, 2013, the Court permitted these
plaintiffs thirty additional days to comply. They have not done
so. Accordingly, the above-captioned cases are dismissed with
prejudice.

## SO ORDERED.

Dated:

New York, New York

May 10, 2013

JOHN F. KEENAN

United States District Judge